

The abc - conjecture is true
for at least $N(c)$, $1 \leq N(c) < \varphi(c)/2$, partitions a, b of c

Constantin M. Petridi,
 11 Apollonos Street, 151 24 Maroussi (Athens), Greece, cpetridi@hotmail.com

Abstract

We prove that for any positive integer c there are at least $N(c)$, $1 \leq N(c) < \varphi(c)/2$ representations of c as a sum of two positive integers a, b , with no common divisor, such that the $N(c)$ radicals $R(abc)$ are all greater than kc , where k an absolute constant.

Preliminaries. Let $c = q_1^{a_1} q_2^{a_2} \cdots q_\omega^{a_\omega}$, q_i diferent primes, $a_i \geq 1$, be a positive integer. Denote its radical $q_1 q_2 \cdots q_\omega$ by $R(c)$, and similarly $R(n)$ for any integer n . Consider the positive solutions of the Diophantine equation $x + y = c$, $(x, y) = 1$, $x < y$. Their number is $\varphi(c)/2$ (φ : Euler function). Denoting them in some order by a_i, b_i , $1 \leq i \leq \varphi(c)/2$, and listing them with their respective radicals, one has

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 + b_1 &= c & R(a_1 b_1 c) \\ a_2 + b_2 &= c & R(a_2 b_2 c) \\ &\dots & \dots \\ a_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} + b_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} &= c & R(a_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} b_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} c). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Form the product of above radicals

$$G_c = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} R(a_i b_i c).$$

$G_c^{2/\varphi(c)}$ is the geometric mean of the radicals.

Throughout the paper p designates prime numbers.

Definition. We introduce a function $E_c(x)$ defined for any real x by

$$E_c(x) := \left[\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{1} \right] - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i} \right] + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} \right] - \cdots + (-1)^\omega \left[\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} \right],$$

which for positive integers x plays a key role in our investigations. If the numbers in the integral part brackets are integers the function reduces to

$$\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{1} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i} + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} - \cdots + (-1)^\omega \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} = \frac{1}{x} \varphi(c). \tag{2}$$

Following theorem gives an explicit expression for G_c .

Theorem 1.

$$G_c = R(c)^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} \prod_{\substack{2 \leq p < c \\ (p,c)=1}} p^{E_c(p)}.$$

Proof. Consider *all* positive solutions of the Diophantine equation $x + y = c$, $x \leq y$, and their corresponding radicals $R(xyc)$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + (c-1) &= c & R(1(c-1)c) \\ 2 + (c-2) &= c & R(2(c-2)c) \\ &\dots & \dots \\ \left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor + \left(c - \left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor \right) &= c & R\left(\left\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \right\rfloor \left[c - \frac{c}{2} \right] c \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Equalities (3) comprise equalities (1), but include also those for which $(x, y) > 1$. That all q_i appear $\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}$ times in G_c is obvious. Consequently, so does their product $R(c)$. For primes $p \neq q_i$, we apply the inclusion-exclusion principle. As all numbers $< c$ do occur in the equalities (3), the number of times p appears in the radicals (3) is $\lfloor \frac{c}{p} \rfloor$. The number of times pq_i appears in the radicals (3) is $\sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \lfloor \frac{1}{pq_i} \rfloor$. The number of times pq_iq_j appears in the radicals (3) is $\sum_{i,j=1}^{\omega} \lfloor \frac{1}{pq_iq_j} \rfloor$, e.t.c. Inserting these values in the inclusion-exclusion formula we get for the total number of times p appears in the radicals (3)

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{p} \frac{c}{1} \right\rfloor - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{p} \frac{c}{q_i} \right\rfloor + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{p} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} \right\rfloor - \dots + (-1)^{\omega} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{p} \frac{c}{q_1 \dots q_{\omega}} \right\rfloor = E_c(p),$$

as stated in the theorem.

Corollary 1. If d denotes the divisors of c , then

$$\prod_{d|c} G_d = q_1^{\Theta(q_1)} \dots q_{\omega}^{\Theta(q_{\omega})} \prod_{\substack{2 \leq p < c \\ (p,c)=1}} p^{\lfloor \frac{c}{p} \rfloor},$$

where

$$\Theta(q_i) = \sum_{\substack{d \equiv 0(q_i) \\ d|c}} \frac{\varphi(d)}{2} + \sum_{\substack{d \not\equiv 0(q_i) \\ d|c}} E_d(q_i).$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 1 to the divisors d of c one has

$$G_d = R(d)^{\frac{\varphi(d)}{2}} \prod_{\substack{2 \leq p < d \\ (p,d)=1}} p^{E_d(p)}.$$

Multiplying over all $\tau(c)$ divisors and using the, easily established, fact that

$$\prod_{\substack{x+y=c \\ x \leq y}} R(xyc) = R(c)^{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor} \prod_{\substack{2 \leq p < c \\ (p,c)=1}} p^{\lfloor \frac{c}{p} \rfloor},$$

gives for $\prod_{d|c} G_d$ the result.

The corollary will not be used in the sequel.

We shall now prove certain Lemmas regarding the function $E_c(p)$. We shall also list, without proof, some well known facts from the elementary theory of primes so as not to interrupt the main body of the proof. Absolute constants will be denoted by k_i , indexed in the order they first appear.

Lemma 1. For $x > 0$ (actually for any $x \neq 0$)

$$\frac{\varphi(c)}{x} - 2^{\omega-1} < E_c(x) < \frac{\varphi(c)}{x} + 2^{\omega-1}. \quad (4)$$

Proof. By definition one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{1} - \binom{\omega}{0} &< \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{1} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{1} \\ &- \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i} \leq - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i} \right\rfloor < \binom{\omega}{1} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i} \\ &\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} - \binom{\omega}{2} < \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} \right\rfloor \leq \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \omega} \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_i q_j} \\ &\dots \qquad \dots \qquad \dots \\ \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} - \binom{\omega}{\omega} &< (-1)^\omega \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega}, \quad \omega \equiv 0(2) \\ -\frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} &\leq (-1)^\omega \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} \right\rfloor < \binom{\omega}{\omega} - \frac{1}{x} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega}, \quad \omega \equiv 1(2). \end{aligned}$$

Adding term-wise above inequalities, we have

$$\frac{c}{x} \left\{ 1 - \sum \frac{1}{q_i} + \sum \frac{1}{q_i q_j} - \cdots \right\} - \sum_{\nu \equiv 0(2)} \binom{\omega}{\nu} < E_c(x) < \frac{c}{x} \left\{ 1 - \sum \frac{1}{q_i} + \sum \frac{1}{q_i q_j} - \cdots \right\} + \sum_{\nu \equiv 1(2)} \binom{\omega}{\nu}.$$

Considering that

$$\sum_{\nu \equiv 0(2)} \binom{\omega}{\nu} = \sum_{\nu \equiv 1(2)} \binom{\omega}{\nu} = 2^{\omega-1},$$

we have by (2), as required,

$$\frac{\varphi(c)}{x} - 2^{\omega-1} < E_c(x) < \frac{\varphi(c)}{x} + 2^{\omega-1}.$$

Lemma 2.

$$E_c(x) > \begin{cases} \frac{\varphi(c)}{x} - 2^{\omega-1} & \text{for } 0 < x < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} \\ 1 & \text{for } \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} < x < c. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The expression $\frac{\varphi(c)}{x} - 2^{\omega-1}$ is positive for all $0 < x < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}$. For $x > \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}$ the lowest limit of $E_c(x)$ is 1, since $x < c$.

Lemma 3. If one (or more) of the prime factors q_i , has exponent $a_i \geq 2$ then

$$E_c(q_i) = \frac{\varphi(c)}{q_i}.$$

Proof. Writing q_i instead of x in (2), and renaming the running indexes, one has

$$E_c(q_i) = \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{1} \right] - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j} \right] + \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j q_k} \right] - \cdots + (-1)^\omega \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} \right].$$

Since by supposition the exponent of q_i is at least ≥ 2 the numbers within the integral part brackets are integers so that we can skip the brackets. This gives by (2)

$$\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{1} - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \omega} \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j} + \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j q_k} - \cdots + (-1)^\omega \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_1 \cdots q_\omega} = \frac{\varphi(c)}{q_i},$$

as stated.

Lemma 4. If one (or more) of the prime factors q_i has exponent $a_i = 1$, then

$$E_c(q_i) = \frac{\varphi(c)}{q_i - 1} - E_{c/q_i}(q_i).$$

Proof. For convenience, putting $\bar{c} = c/q_i$, renaming indexes as above, and writing on the left hand side the terms of the $E_c(q_i)$ - function vertically, we have following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{1} \right] &= \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{1} \right] \\ &- \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j} \right] = - \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i} \right] - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_j} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_j q_k} \right] = + \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_j} \right] + \sum_{2 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_j q_k} \right] \\ &\quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \\ (-1)^{\omega-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_\nu \leq \omega-1} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_{j_1} \cdots q_{j_{\omega-1}}} \right] &= (-1)^{\omega-1} \sum_{2 \leq j_\nu \leq \omega-1} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_{j_1} \cdots q_{j_{\omega-1}}} \right] + (-1)^{\omega-1} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_2 \cdots q_\omega} \right] \\ (-1)^\omega \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{c}{q_1 q_2 \cdots q_\omega} \right] &= (-1)^\omega \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_1 q_2 \cdots q_\omega} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Adding these equalities, the sum of the left hand side terms is, as said, $E_c(q_i)$.

The right hand side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ - \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i} \right] + \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_j} \right] - \cdots + (-1)^{\omega-1} \sum_{2 \leq j_\nu \leq \omega-1} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_{j_1} \cdots q_{j_{\omega-2}}} \right] + (-1)^\omega \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_i q_1 q_2 \cdots q_\omega} \right] \right\} \\ &+ \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{1} \right] - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_j} \right] + \sum_{2 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_j q_k} \right] - \cdots + (-1)^{\omega-1} \left[\frac{1}{q_i} \frac{q_i \bar{c}}{q_1 q_2 \cdots q_\omega} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Cancelling q_i within the brackets, the first brace is clearly equal to $-E_{\bar{c}}(q_i)$. In the second brace, as all q_j, q_k , $2 \leq j, k \leq \omega$ divide $\bar{c}$, the numbers within the integral part brackets are integers. We therefore can write it

$$\bar{c} \left(1 - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \frac{1}{q_j} + \sum_{2 \leq j, k \leq \omega} \frac{1}{q_j q_k} - \dots + (-1)^{\omega-1} \frac{1}{q_2 \dots q_\omega} \right) = \bar{c} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq \omega} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_j} \right) = \varphi(\bar{c}).$$

Substituting the found values in the sum of above equalities and noting that $\varphi(\bar{c}) = \varphi(c)/(q-1)$, since $(c, \bar{c}) = 1$, we finally get

$$E_c(q_i) = \frac{\varphi(c)}{q_i - 1} - E_{c/q_i}(q_i),$$

which proves the Lemma.

Lemma 5.

$$e^{k_1 c} < \prod_{2 \leq p \leq c} p < e^{k_2 c}.$$

Proof. This is the multiplicative form of Tchebycheff's estimate for $\sum_{2 \leq p \leq c} \log p$, namely,

$$k_1 c < \sum_{2 \leq p \leq c} \log p < k_2 c,$$

for $c \geq 2$, with k_1, k_2 positive absolute constants.

Lemma 6.

$$e^{-k_3 c} < \prod_{2 \leq p \leq c} p^{\frac{1}{p}} < e^{k_3 c}.$$

Proof. This is the multiplicative form of Tchebycheff's estimate for $\sum_{2 \leq p \leq c} \frac{1}{p} \log p$, namely,

$$\log c - k_3 < \sum_{2 \leq p \leq c} \frac{1}{p} \log p < \log c + k_3,$$

for $c \geq 2$, with k_3 a positive absolute constant.

We now state a result which gives a lower bound for the geometric mean $G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$ in terms of the prime factors q_i of c and their respective exponents a_i .

Theorem 2.

$$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > k_4 \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{2a_i - 1 - \frac{2}{\varphi(c)} E_c(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i - 1}{2} \right)^2,$$

where k_4 a positive absolute constant.

Proof. We transform the expression given for G_c in Theorem 1, as follows:

$$G_c = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} \prod_{\substack{2 \leq p < c \\ (p, c) = 1}} p^{E_c(p)}$$

$$= \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{-E_c(q_i)} \prod_{2 \leq p \leq c} p^{E_c(p)}.$$

Joining the first two products into one and splitting the third product as indicated we have

$$G_c = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p^{E_c(p)} \prod_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} < p < c} p^{E_c(p)}.$$

Applying Lemma 2 to the second and third product and splitting the products in an obvious way, we get successively

$$\begin{aligned} G_c &> \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{p} - 2^{\omega-1}} \prod_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} < p < c} p \\ &> \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \left\{ \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}^{\varphi(c)} \left\{ \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p \right\}^{-2^{\omega-1}} \left\{ \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p \right\}^{-1} \prod_{2 \leq p < c} p. \end{aligned}$$

Joining the third and the fourth product into one, we have

$$G_c > \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \left\{ \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}^{\varphi(c)} \left\{ \prod_{2 \leq p < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} p \right\}^{-(2^{\omega-1}+1)} \prod_{2 \leq p < c} p.$$

Applying Lemma 6 to the second product, Lemma 5 to the third and fourth product, we have

$$G_c > \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \left\{ e^{-k_3 \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} \right\}^{\varphi(c)} \left\{ e^{k_2 \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}} \right\}^{-(2^{\omega-1}+1)} e^{k_1 c}.$$

Summing the exponents of e , we have

$$G_c > \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2} - E_c(q_i)} \right) \left(\frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} \right)^{\varphi(c)} e^{-k_3 \varphi(c) + k_1 c - k_2 \varphi(c) - k_2 \frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}}}.$$

Raising this inequality to the power $\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}$, we get for the geometric mean $G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$

$$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{1 - \frac{2}{\varphi(c)} E_c(q_i)} \right) \left(\frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} \right)^2 e^{-2k_3 + 2k_1 \frac{c}{\varphi(c)} - 2k_2(1 + \frac{1}{2^{\omega-1}})}. \quad (5)$$

Evaluating the second parenthesis we have

$$\left(\frac{\varphi(c)}{2^{\omega-1}} \right)^2 = 4 \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{2a_i-2} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2.$$

On the other hand, since $\frac{c}{\varphi(c)} > 1$ and $1 + \frac{1}{2^{\omega-1}} \leq 2$, the entire exponent of e appearing in (4) is $> -2k_3 + 2k_1 - 4k_2$. Setting $k_4 = 4e^{2k_1-4k_2-2k_3}$ as a new absolute constant and substituting in (5) we finally get

$$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > k_4 \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} q_i^{2a_i-1-\frac{2}{\varphi(c)} E_c(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2,$$

which completes the proof.

Theorem 3.

$$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > k c,$$

where k a positive absolute constant.

Proof. Denote the expressions within the product of Theorem 2 by $F(q_i, a_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq \omega$.

For $a_i = 1$ by application of Lemma 4 and taking into account that for $x > 0$, $E_c(x) \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(q_i, a_i) &= q_i^{2a_i-1-\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}E_c(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2 \\ &= q_i^{1-\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}E_c(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2 \\ &= q_i^{\frac{q_i-3}{q_i-1}+\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}E_{c/q_i}(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2 \\ &> q_i^{\frac{q_i-3}{q_i-1}} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Elementary considerations give for $q_i \geq 5$

$$F(q_i, 1) > q_i^{\frac{q_i-3}{q_i-1}} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{1}{1} \right) q_i.$$

The exceptions are $q_i = 2$, resp. 3 for which

$$F(2, 1) > \left(\frac{1}{16} \right) 2$$

$$F(3, 1) > \left(\frac{1}{3} \right) 3.$$

For $a_i \geq 2$ we have by application of Lemma 3

$$\begin{aligned} F(q_i, a_i) &= q_i^{2a_i-1-\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}E_c(q_i)} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2 \\ &= q_i^{2a_i-1-\frac{2}{q_i}} \left(\frac{q_i-1}{2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Elementary considerations give for $q_i \geq 3$

$$F(q_i, a_i) > q_i^{a_i}.$$

The exception is $q_i = 2$ for which

$$F(2, a_i) > \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) 2^{a_i}.$$

Summarizing, above inequalities take one of following six forms, depending on the, mutually exclusive, combinations of the exceptional factors $F(2, 1), F(3, 1), F(2, a_i)$ that may occur in the product $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \omega} F(q_i, a_i)$

$$\begin{array}{llll}
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 c & \text{exceptional factor} & \text{—} \\
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 \frac{1}{16} c & \text{exceptional factor} & F(2, 1) \\
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 \frac{1}{3} c & \text{exceptional factor} & F(3, 1) \\
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{3} c & \text{exceptional factor} & F(2, 1), F(3, 1) \\
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 \frac{1}{4} c & \text{exceptional factor} & F(2, a_i) \\
G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} & > & k_4 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{3} c & \text{exceptional factor} & F(2, a_i), F(3, 1)
\end{array}$$

It results that all cases are included in

$$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > k c,$$

where k an absolute constant ($= \frac{1}{48} k_4$), as stated in the Theorem.

Theorem 4. For any positive integer c there is an integer $N = N(c)$, $1 \leq N < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2}$ such that at least N of the radicals figuring in (1), denoted generally by $R(abc)$ satisfy

$$R(abc) > k c,$$

where k the absolute constant of Theorem 3.

Proof. Arrange the $\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}$ radicals in (1) in ascending order

$$R_{i_1}, R_{i_2}, \dots, R_{i_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}}}.$$

$G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$ is their geometric mean and hence

$$R_{i_1} < G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} < R_{i_{\frac{\varphi(c)}{2}}}.$$

Let $N = N(c)$ be the number of radicals $> G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$, $1 \leq N < \frac{\varphi(c)}{2}$. Since by Theorem 3, $G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}} > k c$ it follows a fortiori that for these N radicals we have

$$R(abc) > k c,$$

as was to be proved.

Comment. For the radicals $> G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$, the assertion of Theorem 4 is stronger than the abc -conjecture

$$R(abc) > k(\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} c^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon > 0,$$

since the exponent of c is 1 and k is absolute.

It is weaker, however, than the *abc*-conjecture because it does not say anything regarding the radicals $< G_c^{\frac{2}{\varphi(c)}}$.

Acknowledgment. I am indebted to Peter Krikelis of the University of Athens for his unfailing assistance.